

First-principles computation of the Born effective charges and their band-by-band decomposition

Ph. Ghosez and X. Gonze

*Unité de Physico-Chimie et de Physique des Matériaux, Université Catholique de Louvain,
1 Place Croix du Sud, B-1348 Louvain-la-Neuve, Belgium*

(November 14, 2017)

The Born effective charge, Z^* , that describes the polarization created by collective atomic displacements, can be computed from first-principles by different techniques. Its band-by-band decomposition appeared recently as a powerful tool for the microscopic characterisation of the bonding in solids. We describe the connections between the different expressions used for the computation of Z^* , and analyze the possible associated band-by-band decompositions. We show that unlike for the full Z^* , the different band-by-band values are not equal, and emphasize that one of them has an interesting physical meaning.

I. INTRODUCTION

The Born effective charge (Z^*) describes the macroscopic polarization induced, in a crystalline insulating solid, by the collective displacements of nuclei belonging to a given sublattice. In the lattice dynamics study of insulating crystals, this tensor is usually considered as a fundamental quantity [1], because it governs the amplitude of the long-range Coulomb interaction between nuclei, and the splitting between longitudinal (LO) and transverse (TO) optic phonon modes.

In simple materials, like $A^N B^{8-N}$ binary crystals [2], in which phonon eigenvectors are imposed by symmetry, infra-red measurement of the splitting between LO and TO modes allows an accurate estimation of $|Z^*|^2/\epsilon_\infty$ and offers an unambiguous way to extract the amplitude of Z^* (its sign remains undefined) from the experiment. However, in more complex materials like ABO_3 compounds, LO and TO mode eigenvectors are not necessarily equivalent and the determination of Z^* from the experimental data is not so straightforward : the value can only be approximated within some “realistic” hypothesis [3]. For such compounds, the development of theoretical methods giving directly access to Z^* was therefore particularly interesting.

Being defined in term of response to atomic displacements, the Born effective charge is a *dynamical* concept that cannot be assimilated to conventional static charges [4]. In particular, the amplitude of Z^* cannot be estimated from the inspection of the ground-state electronic density alone : It is also dependent on the electronic current flowing through the crystal when nuclei are displaced. In some materials, this current may be anomalously large and the amplitude of Z^* can deviate substantially from that of the nominal ionic charges [5–10].

During the early seventies, the physics of the Born effective charges was already widely discussed within various semi-empirical models [4,11–14]. Since that time, different theoretical advances have been performed toward their first-principles determination. A first powerful and systematic procedure was introduced by Baroni, Giannozzi and Testa [15], who suggested to determine Z^* from a linear response formalism grounded on a Sternheimer equation. A different algorithm, based on a variational principle, was then reported by Gonze, Allan and Teter [16], yielding a new expression for Z^* . Thanks to recent progress in the theory of the macroscopic polarization, Z^* is now also directly accessible from finite difference of polarization [17]. If the first two methods were exclusively implemented within the density functional formalism (DFT), the last one also allowed calculations of changes in polarization within different other one-electron schemes (Hartree-Fock method [18], model GW approximations to many-body theory [19,20], Harrison tight-binding model [21]) and the Hubbard tight-binding model [22].

The Born effective charges are now routinely computed within DFT and accurate prediction have been reported for a large variety of materials. Without being exhaustive, these calculations concern monoatomic crystals as selenium [23], various I-VII [24,25], II-VI [26,27], III-V [28,29], IV-IV [30–32] or IV-VI [33] semiconductors as well as a large diversity of oxydes (AO [34,35], AO_2 [16,8,36], AO_3 [10], ABO_3 [5–7,37]) and even more exotic materials as Al_2Ru [9]. The previous results exclusively concern crystalline materials but recently a calculation of Z^* in a model of amorphous silica has also been reported [38].

Going beyond the bare determination of Z^* , the first-principles approach was also offering a new opportunity to investigate the microscopic mechanisms monitoring its amplitude. In some recent studies [39,40,19,35], the decomposition of individual contributions from separate groups of occupied bands to Z^* appeared particularly useful : The amplitude of Z^* can be related to dynamical changes of hybridizations and the band-by-band decomposition allowed to identify the orbitals involved in such a mechanism.

In the present paper, we aim at presenting the links between the theoretical frameworks used nowadays for the computation of Born effective charges, and deduce from this comparison the correct way to develop a band-by-band analysis. We note that unitary transformations among occupied states, called “gauge transformations” are present at different levels in the formalism. These unitary transforms need to be treated carefully in order to obtain physical results. Also, the computation of a band-by-band decomposition might be conceived from responses to an homogeneous electric field or to a collective ionic displacement. However, some care is needed here in order to yield physically meaningful quantities. The final expression that we propose is directly linked to displacements of the center of gravity of Wannier functions.

In a first section, we make a brief overview of the different procedures that, historically, have been considered to determine Z^* from first-principles. In section II, we detail how Z^* can be computed within DFT in the Berry phase approach and the linear response formalism (either from the response to an homogeneous electric field or a collective ionic displacement). We take into account the possible gauge transformations. Starting from the general expressions of Z^* , we then describe in Section III how contributions of isolated sets of bands can be separated from each others. We discuss the physical significance of such band-by-band contributions in terms of Wannier functions. We illustrate our discussion with a band-by-band decomposition of the titanium charge in BaTiO₃, using different expressions.

II. OVERVIEW OF THE DIFFERENT THEORETICAL FORMULATIONS OF Z^*

A. Equivalent definitions of Z^*

For periodic systems, the Born effective charge tensor $Z_{\kappa,\alpha\beta}^*$ of nuclei belonging to the sublattice κ is conventionally defined as the coefficient of proportionality relating, under the condition of zero macroscopic electric field, the change in macroscopic polarization \mathcal{P}_β along the direction β and the collective nuclear displacements of atoms κ along direction α , times the unit cell volume Ω_o :

$$Z_{\kappa,\alpha\beta}^* = \Omega_o \left. \frac{\partial \mathcal{P}_\beta}{\partial \tau_{\kappa\alpha}} \right|_{\mathcal{E}=0}. \quad (1)$$

We note the important condition of vanishing macroscopic electric field, necessary to fix unambiguously the amplitude of the change of polarization. Similarly, other dynamical charges may be defined from the change of polarization induced by a sublattice displacement when imposing other conditions on the field \mathcal{E} . These charges (Callen charge [41], Szigeti charge [42]) can be related to Z^* thanks to expressions involving the dielectric tensor (see, for instance, Ref. [43]).

The standard definition of Z^* , Eq. (1), emphasizes the response with respect to the collective nuclear displacement. However, a thermodynamical equality relates the macroscopic polarization to the derivative of the electric enthalpy \tilde{E} with respect to a homogeneous electric field. Similarly another relationship connects the forces on the nuclei to the derivative of the electric enthalpy with respect to atomic displacements. Combining these expressions, Z^* can be formulated, either as a mixed second-order derivative of the electric enthalpy,

$$Z_{\kappa,\alpha\beta}^* = - \frac{\partial^2 \tilde{E}}{\partial \mathcal{E}_\beta \partial \tau_{\kappa\alpha}}, \quad (2)$$

or as the derivative of the force felt by a nucleus κ with respect to an homogeneous effective electric field \mathcal{E}_β , at zero atomic displacements :

$$Z_{\kappa,\alpha\beta}^* = \left. \frac{\partial F_{\kappa,\alpha}}{\partial \mathcal{E}_\beta} \right|_{\tau_{\kappa\alpha}=0}. \quad (3)$$

The three previous definitions – Eqs. (1), (2), and (3) – are formally equivalent. However, as it is now described, each of them can lead to different algorithms for the computation of Z^* .

B. The computation of Z^* based on finite differences of the polarization

From Eq. (1), it appears that an easy access to the macroscopic polarization would allow the computation of Z^* by finite difference. Starting from the equilibrium positions of the atoms and considering a small but finite collective

displacement $\Delta\tau_{\kappa,\alpha}$ in direction α of the atoms belonging to the sublattice κ , we obtain the following finite-difference estimate of Z^* from the change of polarization in zero-field :

$$Z_{\kappa,\alpha\beta}^* = \Omega_o \lim_{\Delta\tau_{\kappa,\alpha} \rightarrow 0} \frac{\Delta\mathcal{P}_\beta}{\Delta\tau_{\kappa,\alpha}} \quad (4)$$

In the earliest first-principles computation of Z^* , in 1972, Bennett and Maradudin [44] had attempted to deduce Z^* using this technique, but as pointed out by Martin [45], on the basis of an incorrect expression for the polarization, yielding boundary-sensitive results. The basic problem was that the change of polarization was assimilated to the change of the unit cell dipole, which is ill-defined for delocalized periodic charge distributions. A supercell technique, allowing correct estimation of the polarization induced by longitudinal atomic displacements, was then proposed by Martin and Kunc [46,47] to compute the longitudinal charge, giving indirectly access to Z^* thanks to the knowledge of the optical dielectric constant.

In 1992, Resta [48] formulated the change of polarization as an integrated macroscopic current. This yielded King-Smith and Vanderbilt [17] to identify in the change of electronic polarization a geometric quantum phase (or Berry phase). They proposed a new scheme, useful for a practical calculation of the macroscopic polarization [49] and from which Z^* can be deduced by finite difference, from single cell calculations. It is usually referred to as the Berry phase approach.

C. The computation of Z^* based on linear responses

Alternatively, the derivatives can also be computed explicitly using perturbation theory. During the early seventies, the linear response of solids to collective nuclear displacements was formulated in term of the inverse dielectric matrix ϵ^{-1} . Accordingly, an expression was proposed for calculating the Born effective charges [50–52]. Computations based on this formalism were, for example, reported by Resta and Baldereschi [26,53]. However, one important drawback of this procedure was the difficulty to control and to guarantee the charge neutrality, which imposes constraints on the off-diagonal elements of ϵ^{-1} [54]. Consequently, Vogl [54] proposed a method that bypasses the inversion of the dielectric function by using directly the self-consistent potential induced by a long-wavelength lattice displacement. Unfortunately, at that time, there was no way to determine accurately this potential : it had to be approximated and this formulation was only applied to simplified models [55,56].

A solution to this problem was reported in 1987 by Baroni, Giannozzi and Testa [15,28] who proposed, within DFT, to compute the total effective potential by solving a self-consistent first-order Sternheimer equation. It was the first “ab initio” powerful and systematic approach yielding accurate value of Z^* . Both types of perturbation (the response to an homogeneous electric field or to a collective ionic displacement) could be considered in this approach, giving access to expressions linked to Eqs. (1) and (3). A variational formulation of this theory was then reported by Gonze, Allan and Teter [16,57,58], offering a different algorithm for the calculation of the first-order wavefunctions and a new, stationary, expression for $Z_{\kappa,\alpha\beta}^*$, linked to Eqs. (2). The “Sternheimer” and “variational” formalisms were first implemented within DFT when using plane-wave and different kind of pseudopotentials [28,6,59,60] (usually within the LDA, but also within the GGA [61]). Later, LMTO [62] and LAPW [63] versions of the linear response approaches have also been proposed.

D. The computation of Z^* based on finite differences of the atomic forces

In a similar spirit to the Berry phase approach, starting from Eq. (3), Z^* might also *a priori* be estimated from the force linearly induced on the different atoms by a finite homogeneous electric field, when keeping the atomic positions frozen :

$$Z_{\kappa,\alpha\beta}^* = \lim_{\Delta\mathcal{E}_\beta \rightarrow 0} \frac{\Delta F_{\kappa,\alpha}}{\Delta\mathcal{E}_\beta} \quad (5)$$

The force felt by an atom can be trivially computed using the Hellmann-Feynman theorem. However, the basic problem inherent to this method is that infinite periodic systems (as those considered in practical calculations) cannot sustain a finite linear change of potential. Different supercell techniques, that circumvent the problem, have been proposed to compute Z^* by Kunc and Martin [47] (from the force in the depolarizing field associated to a longitudinal phonon) and by Kunc and Resta [64,65] (from the force in an applied sawlike potential). Their calculations demonstrate the feasibility of the approach. Up to now, it was however only marginally applied. For that reason, in what follows, we will concentrate on the linear response formalism and the Berry phase approach.

III. ANALYSIS OF THE MATHEMATICAL LINKS BETWEEN THE DIFFERENT FORMULATIONS

A. Ionic and electronic contributions

For practical purposes, the Born effective charge can be conveniently decomposed into two contributions :

$$Z_{\kappa,\alpha\beta}^* = Z_{\kappa}\delta_{\alpha\beta} + Z_{\kappa,\alpha\beta}^{el} \quad (6)$$

The first term, Z_{κ} , is the charge of the nuclei (or pseudo-ion, in case of pseudopotential calculations), and can be trivially identified. The second, $Z_{\kappa,\alpha\beta}^{el}$, is the contribution due to the electrons, in response to the perturbation. In this Section we analyse the mathematical links existing between the different expressions that can be used to determine this last contribution within the density functional formalism. Similar expressions should be obtained within other frameworks as the Hartree-Fock method.

B. The Berry phase approach

As previously mentioned, a straightforward approach to the determination of Z_{κ}^* consists in computing the difference of macroscopic polarization between a reference state, and a state where the atoms belonging to the sublattice κ have been displaced by a small but finite distance $\Delta\tau_{\kappa,\alpha}$. Combining Eqs. (4) and (6), the electronic contribution to this charge can be obtained as :

$$Z_{\kappa,\alpha\beta}^{el} = \Omega_o \lim_{\Delta\tau_{\kappa,\alpha} \rightarrow 0} \frac{\Delta\mathcal{P}_{\beta}^{el}}{\Delta\tau_{\kappa,\alpha}} \quad (7)$$

As demonstrated recently by King-Smith and Vanderbilt [17], in periodic systems, the change in electronic polarization in zero field can be deduced from the following formula :

$$\mathcal{P}_{\beta}^{el} = -\frac{1}{(2\pi)^3} i \sum_n^{occ} s \int_{BZ} \langle u_{n\mathbf{k}} | \frac{\partial}{\partial k_{\beta}} | u_{n\mathbf{k}} \rangle d\mathbf{k} \quad (8)$$

where s is the occupation number of states in the valence bands ($s = 2$ in spin-degenerate system) and $u_{n\mathbf{k}}$ is the periodic part of the Bloch functions. Taken independently at each wavevector \mathbf{k} in the Brillouin zone, the matrix elements of the previous equation are ill-defined. Indeed, the phase of the wavefunctions at each wavevector is arbitrary, and thus unrelated with the phases at neighbouring wavevectors : The derivative of the wavefunctions with respect to their wavevector has a degree of arbitrariness. However, the *integral* of the right-hand side is a well-defined quantity, which has the form of a Berry phase of band n , as discussed by Zak [66].

The King-Smith and Vanderbilt definition is valid *only* if the wavefunctions fulfill the *periodic gauge* condition. This means that the periodic part of Bloch functions must satisfy

$$u_{n\mathbf{k}}(\mathbf{r}) = e^{i\mathbf{G}\cdot\mathbf{r}} u_{n\mathbf{k}+\mathbf{G}}(\mathbf{r}), \quad (9)$$

This condition does not fix unambiguously the phase of the wavefunctions at a given \mathbf{k} -point (even not at neighbouring \mathbf{k} -points) but it imposes a constraint between wavefunctions at distant wavevectors. It defines a topology in \mathbf{k} -space, within which the polarization takes the convenient form of a Berry phase.

When working within one-electron schemes (DFT, Hartree-Fock, ...), a generalized choice of phase is also present at *another* level. For the ground-state, the Lagrange multiplier method applied to the minimization of the Hohenberg and Kohn functional under orthonormalization conditions on the wavefunctions [67], gives the following equations :

$$H_{\mathbf{k}}|u_{m\mathbf{k}}\rangle = \sum_n^{occ} \Lambda_{mn,\mathbf{k}} |u_{n\mathbf{k}}\rangle \quad (10)$$

This condition, associated with the minimisation of the Hohenberg and Kohn energy functional, means that the wavefunctions $u_{n\mathbf{k}}$ must define a Hilbert space (right-hand side of Eq. (10)), in which the vector generated by the application of the Hamiltonian to one of these wavevectors (left-hand side of Eq. (10)) must lie. We observe that a unitary transformation between the wavefunctions will leave the Hilbert space invariant, and Eq. (10) will be satisfied

provided the matrix of Lagrange multiplier $\Lambda_{mn,\mathbf{k}}$ is transformed accordingly. In order to build Kohn-Sham band structures, the unitary transform is implicitly chosen such as to guarantee

$$\Lambda_{mn,\mathbf{k}} = \delta_{mn} \epsilon_{m,\mathbf{k}} \quad (11)$$

in which case $\epsilon_{m,\mathbf{k}}$ correspond to the eigenvalues of the Kohn-Sham Hamiltonian and the associated functions $u_{d,m\mathbf{k}}$ are the Kohn-Sham orbitals. This choice is called the *diagonal gauge* condition. All along this work, it will be emphasized by a “*d*” subscript.

We note that the periodic gauge condition connect wavefunctions at different \mathbf{k} -points, while the diagonal gauge condition fixes wavefunctions at a given \mathbf{k} -point. The choice defined by Eq. (11) is *not* mandatory, and the computation of the total energy, the density, or the Berry phase, Eq. (8), will give the *same* value independently of the fulfillment of Eq. (11). If the diagonal gauge is the natural choice for the ground-state wavefunctions, another choice is usually preferred for the change in wavefunctions in linear-response calculations (see below).

From a practical viewpoint, direct evaluation of Eq. (8) is not trivial in numerical calculations because the wavefunctions are only computed at a finite number of points in the Brillouin zone, without any phase relationship between the eigenvectors. An elegant scheme to deal with this problem was reported in Ref. [17]. Also, we note that, associated to the fact that a phase is only defined modulo 2π , Eq. (8) only provides the polarization modulo a “quantum” (in 3-dimensional solids, the quantum is $(s.R_a/\Omega_0)$, where R_a is a vector of the reciprocal lattice). This quantum uncertainty should appear as a limitation of the technique. However, for the purpose of computing Z^* from finite-differences, the atomic displacements $\Delta\tau_{\kappa,\alpha}$ may always be chosen sufficiently small for the associated change of polarization being unambiguously defined.

The Berry phase technique was successfully applied to various ABO_3 compounds [5,7], giving results equivalent to those obtained independently using perturbative techniques [6,68]. A similar agreement was for instance reported for alkaline-earth oxides [34,35].

C. Z^* as the first derivative of the polarization

Instead of approximating Eq. (1) from finite differences, it can be chosen to compute it directly. The combination of Eqs. (1), (6) and (8) gives :

$$Z_{\kappa,\alpha\beta}^{el} = -\frac{\Omega_o}{(2\pi)^3} i \sum_m^{occ} s \int_{BZ} [\langle \frac{\partial u_{n\mathbf{k}}}{\partial \tau_{\kappa,\alpha}} | \frac{\partial u_{n\mathbf{k}}}{\partial k_\beta} \rangle + \langle u_{n\mathbf{k}} | \frac{\partial}{\partial k_\beta} | \frac{\partial u_{n\mathbf{k}}}{\partial \tau_{\kappa,\alpha}} \rangle] d\mathbf{k}. \quad (12)$$

The second expectation value can be worked out :

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{BZ} \langle u_{n\mathbf{k}} | \frac{\partial}{\partial k_\beta} | \frac{\partial u_{n\mathbf{k}}}{\partial \tau_{\kappa,\alpha}} \rangle d\mathbf{k} = \\ \int_{BZ} [\frac{\partial}{\partial k_\beta} \langle u_{n\mathbf{k}} | \frac{\partial u_{n\mathbf{k}}}{\partial \tau_{\kappa,\alpha}} \rangle - \langle \frac{\partial u_{n\mathbf{k}}}{\partial k_\beta} | \frac{\partial u_{n\mathbf{k}}}{\partial \tau_{\kappa,\alpha}} \rangle] d\mathbf{k} \end{aligned} \quad (13)$$

In the previous expression, the first term of the right-hand side is the gradient of a periodic quantity integrated over the Brillouin zone. Within any periodic gauge, Eq. (9), its contribution will be zero. Using the time-reversal symmetry, we arrive therefore at the final expression :

$$Z_{\kappa,\alpha\beta}^{el} = -2 \frac{\Omega_o}{(2\pi)^3} i \sum_n^{occ} s \int_{BZ} \langle \frac{\partial u_{n\mathbf{k}}}{\partial \tau_{\kappa,\alpha}} | \frac{\partial u_{n\mathbf{k}}}{\partial k_\beta} \rangle d\mathbf{k} \quad (14)$$

The first-derivatives of the wave functions, $\frac{\partial}{\partial \tau_{\kappa,\alpha}} u_{n\mathbf{k}}$ and $\frac{\partial}{\partial k_\beta} u_{n\mathbf{k}}$, required to evaluate this expression, can be computed by linear-response techniques either by solving a first-order Sternheimer equation [15,28] or by the direct minimization of a variational expression as described in Ref. [16,57].

We note that the choice of gauge will influence the value of the first-derivative of $u_{n\mathbf{k}}$, although the integrated quantity $Z_{\kappa,\alpha\beta}^{el}$ must remain independent of this choice (in any periodic gauge). Usually, the following choice is preferred in linear-response calculations :

$$\left\langle \frac{\partial u_{n\mathbf{k}}}{\partial \lambda} \right|_p |u_{m\mathbf{k}}\rangle = 0 \quad (15)$$

for m and n labelling occupied states, and λ representing either the derivative with respect to the wavevector or to atomic displacements. As emphasized by the notation (“ $|_p$ ”), this condition defines what is called the *parallel gauge* and insures that the changes in the occupied wavefunctions are orthogonal to the space of the ground-state occupied wavefunctions. This projection on the conduction bands is not reproduced within the diagonal gauge defined by the generalization of Eq. (11) at the first order of perturbation, as elaborated in Ref. [67].

D. Z^* as a mixed second derivative of the electric enthalpy

Considering now Eq. (2), Z^* appears also as a mixed second derivative of the electric enthalpy. Therefore, following the formalism used in Ref. [57,58], $Z_{\kappa,\alpha\beta}^{el}$ can be formulated in terms of a *stationary* expression, involving the first-order derivative of the wavefunctions with respect to a collective displacement of atoms of the sublattice κ and the first-order derivatives of the wavefunctions with respect to an electric field and to their wavevector [69] :

$$\begin{aligned}
Z_{\kappa,\alpha\beta}^{el} = & 2 \left[\frac{\Omega_0}{(2\pi)^3} \int_{\text{BZ}} \sum_m^{\text{occ}} s \left(\left\langle \frac{\partial u_{m\mathbf{k}}}{\partial \tau_{\kappa,\alpha}} \middle| H_{\mathbf{k}} - \epsilon_{m\mathbf{k}} \middle| \frac{\partial u_{m\mathbf{k}}}{\partial \mathcal{E}_\beta} \right\rangle \right. \\
& + \left. \left\langle \frac{\partial u_{m\mathbf{k}}}{\partial \tau_{\kappa,\alpha}} \middle| i \frac{\partial u_{m\mathbf{k}}}{\partial k_\beta} \right\rangle + \left\langle u_{m\mathbf{k}} \middle| \frac{\partial v'_{\text{ext},\mathbf{k}}}{\partial \tau_{\kappa\alpha}} \middle| \frac{\partial u_{m\mathbf{k}}}{\partial \mathcal{E}_\beta} \right\rangle \right) d\mathbf{k} \\
& + \frac{1}{2} \int_{\Omega_0} \left[\frac{\partial v_{\text{xc}0}}{\partial \tau_{\kappa\alpha}}(\mathbf{r}) \right] \left[\frac{\partial n}{\partial \mathcal{E}_\beta}(\mathbf{r}) \right]^* d\mathbf{r} \\
& + 2\pi\Omega_0 \sum_{\mathbf{G} \neq 0} \frac{1}{|\mathbf{G}|^2} \left[\frac{\partial n}{\partial \tau_{\kappa\alpha}}(\mathbf{G}) \right]^* \frac{\partial n}{\partial \mathcal{E}_\beta}(\mathbf{G}) \\
& + \left. \frac{1}{2} \int_{\Omega_0} K_{\text{xc}}(\mathbf{r}, \mathbf{r}') \left[\frac{\partial n}{\partial \tau_{\kappa\alpha}}(\mathbf{r}) \right]^* \frac{\partial n}{\partial \mathcal{E}_\beta}(\mathbf{r}') d\mathbf{r} d\mathbf{r}' \right] \quad (16)
\end{aligned}$$

The *stationary* character of Eq. (16) is related to the influence of inaccuracies of the derivatives $\frac{\partial}{\partial \tau_{\kappa,\alpha}} u_{n\mathbf{k}}$ and $\frac{\partial}{\partial \mathcal{E}_\beta} u_{n\mathbf{k}}$ on the accuracy of $Z_{\kappa,\alpha\beta}^{el}$: the error in the latest is proportional to the *product* of the errors in the two wavefunction derivatives. By contrast, Eq. (14) does not have this property : in that case, the errors on Z^* is directly proportional to the error on $\frac{\partial}{\partial \tau_{\kappa,\alpha}} u_{n\mathbf{k}}$. As briefly discussed below, Eqs. (16) and (14) are mathematically equivalent. However, if both are estimated with approximate wavefunctions, Eq. (16) is more accurate than Eq. (14).

Eq. (14) can be seen to arise from the stationary property of Eq. (16). Indeed, in the latter, the error on Z^* is proportional to the product of the errors on the first-order change in wavefunctions so that if $\frac{\partial}{\partial \tau_{\kappa,\alpha}} u_{n\mathbf{k}}$ was known perfectly, a correct estimation of $Z_{\kappa,\alpha\beta}^{el}$ should be obtained independently of the knowledge of $\frac{\partial}{\partial \mathcal{E}_\beta} u_{n\mathbf{k}}$. Putting therefore to zero $\frac{\partial}{\partial \mathcal{E}_\beta} u_{n\mathbf{k}}$ and the corresponding density changes in Eq. (16), most of the terms cancel out and we recover Eq. (14), which evaluated for the exact $\frac{\partial}{\partial \tau_{\kappa,\alpha}} u_{n\mathbf{k}}$ must still correspond to a valid expression for Z^* . Alternatively, the formal equivalence between Eqs. (14) and (16) should also be trivially established when introducing in Eq. (16) the first-order Sternheimer equation associated to the atomic displacement perturbation.

E. Z^* as the first derivative of the atomic force

By the same token as in the preceding Section, we can choose alternatively for $\frac{\partial}{\partial \tau_{\kappa,\alpha}} u_{n\mathbf{k}}$ and the associated density derivative to vanish in Eq. (16), and we still obtain a valid expression for Z^* :

$$\begin{aligned}
Z_{\kappa,\alpha\beta}^{el} = & 2 \left[\frac{\Omega_0}{(2\pi)^3} \int_{\text{BZ}} \sum_n^{\text{occ}} s \left\langle u_{n\mathbf{k}} \middle| \frac{\partial v'_{\text{ext},\mathbf{k}}}{\partial \tau_{\kappa\alpha}} \middle| \frac{\partial u_{n\mathbf{k}}}{\partial \mathcal{E}_\beta} \right\rangle d\mathbf{k} \right. \\
& \left. + \frac{1}{2} \int_{\Omega_0} \left[\frac{\partial v_{\text{xc}0}}{\partial \tau_{\kappa\alpha}}(\mathbf{r}) \right] \left[\frac{\partial n}{\partial \mathcal{E}_\beta}(\mathbf{r}) \right]^* d\mathbf{r} \right] \quad (17)
\end{aligned}$$

This last equation corresponds to the third formulation of Z^* in which it appears as the first derivative of the force on the atoms κ with respect to an electric field (Eq. (3)). Indeed, it is directly connected to the following expression of the force, deduced from the Hellmann-Feynman theorem :

$$\begin{aligned}
F_{\kappa,\alpha}^{el} &= \frac{\Omega_0}{(2\pi)^3} \int_{BZ} \sum_n^{occ} s \langle u_{n\mathbf{k}} | \frac{\partial w'_{\text{ext},\mathbf{k}}}{\partial \tau_{\kappa\alpha}} | u_{n\mathbf{k}} \rangle d\mathbf{k} \\
&\quad + \int_{\Omega_0} [\frac{\partial u_{xc0}}{\partial \tau_{\kappa\alpha}}(\mathbf{r})][n(\mathbf{r})]^* d\mathbf{r}
\end{aligned} \tag{18}$$

Compared to Eqs. (14) and (16), Eq. (17) has the advantage that the computation of the first-order wavefunction derivative with respect to the electric field perturbation is the *only* computationally intensive step needed to deduce the *full* set of effective charges.

We note however that the implementation of Eq. (17), rather easy within a plane wave – pseudopotential approach, is not so straightforward when the basis set is dependent on the atomic positions, as in LAPW methods (additional Pulay terms must be introduced).

IV. A MEANINGFUL BAND-BY-BAND DECOMPOSITION

A. Problematics

In the previous Section, we have described different approaches for computing $Z_{\kappa,\alpha\beta}^{el}$. In order to have a better insight on the mechanisms monitoring the amplitude of Z^* , it is also useful to separate the partial contribution of electrons from the different occupied bands to $Z_{\kappa,\alpha\beta}^{el}$. In what follows, we describe how to identify the change of polarization induced by the electrons of one specific band and we discuss the meaning of this contribution in terms of Wannier functions.

B. The displacement of center of gravity of Wannier functions

Inspired by a previous discussion by Zak [66], Vanderbilt and King-Smith [70] emphasized that the macroscopic electronic polarization acquires a particular meaning when expressed in terms of localized Wannier functions. The periodic part of Bloch functions $u_{n\mathbf{k}}(\mathbf{r})$ are related to the Wannier functions $W_n(\mathbf{r})$ through the following transformation :

$$u_{n\mathbf{k}}(\mathbf{r}) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{N}} \sum_{\mathbf{R}} e^{-i\mathbf{k}\cdot(\mathbf{r}-\mathbf{R})} W_n(\mathbf{r}-\mathbf{R}) \tag{19}$$

$$\tag{20}$$

$$W_n(\mathbf{r}) = \frac{\sqrt{N} \Omega_o}{(2\pi)^3} \int_{BZ} e^{i\mathbf{k}\cdot\mathbf{r}} u_{n\mathbf{k}}(\mathbf{r}) d\mathbf{k} \tag{21}$$

From this definition, we deduce that :

$$\frac{\partial}{\partial \mathbf{k}_\beta} u_{n\mathbf{k}}(\mathbf{r}) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{N}} \sum_{\mathbf{R}} [-i(r_\beta - R_\beta)] e^{-i\mathbf{k}\cdot(\mathbf{r}-\mathbf{R})} W_n(\mathbf{r}-\mathbf{R}) \tag{22}$$

where \mathbf{R} runs over all real space lattice vectors. Introducing this result in the equation providing P_β (Eq. 8), we obtain :

$$\mathcal{P}_\beta^{el} = \frac{s}{\Omega_o} \sum_n^{occ} \int r_{\beta\cdot} |W_n(\mathbf{r})|^2 d\mathbf{r} \tag{23}$$

From this equation, the electronic part of the polarization is simply deduced from the position of the center of gravity of the electronic charge distribution, as expressed in terms of localized Wannier functions. In other words, for the purpose of determining the polarization, *“the true quantum mechanical electronic system can be considered as an effective classical system of quantized point charges, located at the centers of gravity associated with the occupied Wannier functions in each unit cell”* [70].

We observe that Eqs. (19) and (21) establish a one-to-one correspondence between $u_{n\mathbf{k}}$ and W_n . As previously emphasized in Section III, when working within the *diagonal* gauge, $u_{d,n\mathbf{k}}$ becomes identified with the Kohn-Sham

orbitals so that the associated $W_{d,n}$ will correspond to a single band Wannier function. Within this specific gauge, we can therefore isolate $P_{m,\beta}$, the contribution of band m to the β component of the polarization, by separating the different term in the sum appearing in Eq. (23) :

$$\mathcal{P}_{m,\beta}^{el} = \frac{s}{\Omega_o} \int r_\beta \cdot |W_{d,m}(\mathbf{r})|^2 d\mathbf{r} \quad (24)$$

If we take now the derivative of the polarization with respect to a collective atomic displacement, $Z_{\kappa,\alpha\beta}^{el}$ can be written in terms of Wannier functions as :

$$Z_{\kappa,\alpha\beta}^{el} = \sum_n^{occ} s \int r_\beta \left[\left(\frac{\partial W_n(\mathbf{r})}{\partial \tau_{\kappa,\alpha}} \Big|_d \right)^* W_{d,n}(\mathbf{r}) + (W_{d,n}(\mathbf{r}))^* \frac{\partial W_n(\mathbf{r})}{\partial \tau_{\kappa,\alpha}} \Big|_d \right] d\mathbf{r} \quad (25)$$

As for the polarization, this equation has a simple physical meaning. In response to an atomic displacement, the electronic distribution is modified and the electronic contribution to Z^* can be identified from the displacement of the center of gravity of the occupied Wannier functions. Working within the diagonal gauge at any order of perturbation, we will be able to follow the change of single band Wannier functions all along the path of atomic displacements. In the previous expression, the contribution of band m to $Z_{\kappa,\alpha\beta}^{el}$ can therefore also be isolated :

$$[Z_{\kappa,\alpha\beta}^{el}]_m = s \int r_\beta \left[\left(\frac{\partial W_m(\mathbf{r})}{\partial \tau_{\kappa,\alpha}} \Big|_d \right)^* W_{d,m}(\mathbf{r}) + (W_{d,m}(\mathbf{r}))^* \frac{\partial W_m(\mathbf{r})}{\partial \tau_{\kappa,\alpha}} \Big|_d \right] d\mathbf{r} \quad (26)$$

This last equation identifies the contribution from band m to the Born effective charge as Ω_0 times the *change of polarization corresponding to the displacement of a point charge s on a distance equal to the displacement of the Wannier center of this band.*

Eq. (26) can also easily be evaluated in reciprocal space :

$$[Z_{\kappa,\alpha\beta}^{el}]_m = -2 \frac{\Omega_o}{(2\pi)^3} i s \int_{BZ} \left\langle \frac{\partial u_{m\mathbf{k}}}{\partial \tau_{\kappa,\alpha}} \Big|_d \middle| \frac{\partial u_{m\mathbf{k}}}{\partial k_\beta} \Big|_d \right\rangle d\mathbf{k} \quad (27)$$

As Bloch and Wannier functions were related through a band-by-band transformation, the contribution from band m to $Z_{\kappa,\alpha\beta}^*$ in Eq. (27) keeps the same clear physical meaning as in Eq. (26) : $[Z_{\kappa,\alpha\beta}^{el}]_m$ corresponds to $\Omega_0 \cdot \Delta \mathcal{P}_{m,\beta}^{el} = \Omega_0 (s \cdot \Delta d_\beta)$ where Δd_β is the displacement in direction β of the Wannier center of band m induced by the unitary displacement of the sublattice of atoms κ in direction α . In practical calculations, where each band may be thought as a combinaison of well-known orbitals, the displacement of the Wannier center is associated to the admixture of a new orbital character to the band and must be attributed to dynamical changes of orbital hybridizations. As illustrated in some recent studies [39,40,19,35], the decomposition of Z^* appears therefore as a powerful tool for the microscopic characterisation of the bonding in solids.

Let us emphasize again that the previous decomposition in terms of a single band is valid only if the *diagonal* gauge was used to define the Kohn-Sham wavefunctions, hence the “ d ” subscript in Eq. (26) and (27). The ground-state wavefunctions are conventionally computed within the diagonal gauge. However, in most calculations, the first-derivatives of these wavefunctions are computed within the *parallel* gauge. Within this choice, the change in each Bloch function will be a mixing of different Kohn-Sham orbitals when the perturbation is applied so that the associated change in functions W_n , defined from Eq. (21), will correspond to the change of a multi-band Wannier function. Evaluating Eq. (26) or (27) within such a gauge, we will identify the displacement of a complex of bands but not of a single band. In practice, the first-order derivative of wavefunctions in the diagonal gauge $\frac{du_{m\mathbf{k}}}{d\lambda} \Big|_d$ can be deduced from those in the parallel gauge $\frac{du_{m\mathbf{k}}}{d\lambda} \Big|_p$ and the ground-state wavefunctions in the diagonal gauge $u_{d,n\mathbf{k}}$, by adding contributions from the subspace of the occupied bands :

$$\frac{du_{m\mathbf{k}}}{d\lambda} \Big|_d = \frac{du_{m\mathbf{k}}}{d\lambda} \Big|_p - \sum_{n \neq m}^{occ} \frac{\langle u_{d,n\mathbf{k}} | \frac{\partial H}{\partial \lambda} | u_{d,m\mathbf{k}} \rangle}{(\epsilon_{n\mathbf{k}} - \epsilon_{m\mathbf{k}})} u_{d,n\mathbf{k}} \quad (28)$$

We note that this transformation (Eq. (28)) can present some problems when the denominator vanishes : this happens when the valence energies are degenerated. The problem can be partly bypassed by keeping a parallel transport gauge within the space of degenerated wavefunctions. Practically, this means that we will only be able to separate the contributions of disconnected set of bands.

C. Other band-by-band decompositions

Up to now, we focused on Eq. (14). We would like to investigate whether other band-by-band decompositions could be obtained from Eqs. (16) and (17). These expressions, unlike Eq. (14), are not written as a simple sum of matrix elements, each related with a single band. However, Eq. (17) can still be transformed using a decomposition of the density with respect to the bands :

$$n(\mathbf{r}) = \frac{1}{(2\pi)^3} \int_{BZ} \sum_n^{occ} s u_{n\mathbf{k}}^*(\mathbf{r}) u_{n\mathbf{k}}(\mathbf{r}) d\mathbf{k}. \quad (29)$$

It gives :

$$Z_{\kappa,\alpha\beta}^{el} = 2 \frac{\Omega_0}{(2\pi)^3} \int_{BZ} \sum_n^{occ} s \langle u_{n\mathbf{k}} | \frac{\partial v'_{\text{ext},\mathbf{k}}}{\partial \tau_{\kappa\alpha}} + \frac{\partial v_{\text{xc}0}}{\partial \tau_{\kappa\alpha}} | \frac{\partial u_{n\mathbf{k}}}{\partial \mathcal{E}_\beta} \rangle d\mathbf{k} \quad (30)$$

for which the following decomposition is obtained, using the diagonal gauge wavefunctions :

$$[\tilde{Z}_{\kappa,\alpha\beta}^{el}]_m = 2 \frac{\Omega_0}{(2\pi)^3} \int_{BZ} s \langle u_{d,m\mathbf{k}} | \frac{\partial v'_{\text{ext},\mathbf{k}}}{\partial \tau_{\kappa\alpha}} + \frac{\partial v_{\text{xc}0}}{\partial \tau_{\kappa\alpha}} | \frac{\partial u_{m\mathbf{k}}}{\partial \mathcal{E}_\beta} \Big|_d \rangle d\mathbf{k} \quad (31)$$

This expression corresponds to the contribution of the electrons of band m to the force induced on atom κ by a macroscopic field \mathcal{E}_β . However, it is not equivalent to Eqs. (26) or (27). Indeed, for a particular band m , the difference between matrix elements present in Eq. (27) and (31) is (within a given gauge) :

$$\begin{aligned} & \left[\langle u_{m\mathbf{k}} | \frac{\partial v'_{\text{ext},\mathbf{k}}}{\partial \tau_{\kappa\alpha}} + \frac{\partial v_{\text{xc}0}}{\partial \tau_{\kappa\alpha}} | \frac{\partial u_{m\mathbf{k}}}{\partial \mathcal{E}_\beta} \rangle \right] - \left[\langle \frac{\partial u_{m\mathbf{k}}}{\partial \tau_{\kappa,\alpha}} | -i \frac{\partial u_{m\mathbf{k}}}{\partial k_\beta} \rangle \right] \\ & - \frac{1}{2} \int_{\Omega_0} K_{\text{xc}}(\mathbf{r}, \mathbf{r}') \left[\frac{\partial n}{\partial \tau_{\kappa\alpha}}(\mathbf{r}) \right]^* \frac{\partial n_{m\mathbf{k}}}{\partial \mathcal{E}_\beta}(\mathbf{r}') d\mathbf{r} d\mathbf{r}' \\ & + \frac{1}{2} \int_{\Omega_0} K_{\text{xc}}(\mathbf{r}, \mathbf{r}') \left[\frac{\partial n_{m\mathbf{k}}}{\partial \tau_{\kappa\alpha}}(\mathbf{r}) \right]^* \frac{\partial n}{\partial \mathcal{E}_\beta}(\mathbf{r}') d\mathbf{r} d\mathbf{r}' \end{aligned} \quad (32)$$

where $n_{m\mathbf{k}}(\mathbf{r})$ is a short notation for $u_{m\mathbf{k}}^*(\mathbf{r}) u_{m\mathbf{k}}(\mathbf{r})$. The summation of these differences on all the bands and integration on the Brillouin zone gives zero, as expected. However, the band-by-band difference, Eq. (32), does not vanish. The quantity defined from Eq. (31) is therefore independent from that of Eq. (26) and has no specific meaning in terms of Wannier functions.

D. Numerical comparison of the different decompositions

The previous theoretical results can now be illustrated on a numerical example. In what follows, we will consider the case of barium titanate, a well-known ferroelectric material of the ABO_3 perovskite family, presenting non-trivial values of Z^* . Our calculations have been performed within a planewave-pseudopotential approach. The electronic wavefunctions have been expanded in plane-waves up to a kinetic energy cutoff of 35 hartrees. Integrals over the Brillouin zone have been replaced by sums on a $6 \times 6 \times 6$ mesh of special k-points. The Born effective charges have been obtained by linear response.

In Table I, we compare different decompositions of the titanium charge (Z_{Ti}^*), in the cubic phase. We observe that the results obtained within the diagonal and parallel gauge, either from Eq. (27) or (31) are *significantly* different. As demonstrated previously, the identification of meaningful band-by-band contributions require the use of Eq. (27), when working within the diagonal gauge : the contributions then describe the displacement of the Wannier center of each given set of bands, induced in response to the displacement of the Ti atom. A similar decomposition of the Born effective charge for the other atoms in the unit cell is reported in Refs. [40,43]. In these papers, the origin of anomalous contributions (i.e. the deviation with respect to the reference ionic values) is discussed in terms of dynamical changes of orbital hybridization.

V. CONCLUSIONS

In this paper, we have recalled the three equivalent definitions of Z^* and we have discussed the associated mathematical formulations within the density functional formalism. A particular attention has been placed on the gauge freedom associated to unitary transforms within the subspace of the occupied bands.

Eq. (16) expresses Z^* as a second derivative of the electric enthalpy. Contrary to the other expressions, it has a stationary character and allows the most accurate estimate of Z^* when approximate wavefunctions are used.

Eq. (17) formulates Z^* as the force linearly induced on atoms κ when a macroscopic electric is applied. It is an alternative convenient expression from which the full set of effective charges can be deduced as soon as the derivative of the wavefunctions with respect to the electric field perturbation is known.

Eq. (14) and its finite difference expression – Eq.(7) – consider Z^* in terms of the macroscopic polarization induced by the displacement of the atoms belonging to a given sublattice. Contrary to the other formulations, it yields a meaningful band-by-band decomposition, helpful in the characterisation of the bonding in solids. It has been demonstrated that the contribution of a particular band m to $Z_{\kappa,\alpha\beta}^*$, obtained from this expression when working within the diagonal gauge, is directly related to the displacement of the Wannier center of this band when a sublattice of atoms is displaced.

Finally, it has been shown explicitly, for BaTiO₃, that the band-by-band decompositions, arising from Eqs. (14), (16) or (17), within the parallel or diagonal gauge, yield significantly different results.

-
- [1] M. Born and K. Huang, *Dynamical Theory of Crystal Lattices*, (University Press, Oxford, 1968), p. 265.
 - [2] J. C. Phillips, *Rev. Mod. Phys.* **42**, 317 (1970).
 - [3] J. D. Axe, *Phys. Rev.* **157**, 429 (1967).
 - [4] W. A. Harrison, *Electronic structure and the properties of solids* (W. H. Freeman and Co., San Francisco, 1980).
 - [5] R. Resta, M. Posternak, and A. Baldereschi, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **70**, 1010 (1993).
 - [6] Ph. Ghosez, X. Gonze, and J.-P. Michenaud, *Ferroelectrics* **153**, 91 (1994).
 - [7] W. Zhong, R.D. King-Smith, and D. Vanderbilt, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **72**, 3618 (1994).
 - [8] Ch. Lee, Ph. Ghosez, and X. Gonze, *Phys. Rev. B* **50**, 13379 (1994).
 - [9] S. Ögüt and K. Rabe, *Phys. Rev. B* **54**, R8297 (1996).
 - [10] F. Detraux, Ph. Ghosez, and X. Gonze, *Phys. Rev. B* **56**, 983 (1997).
 - [11] G. Lucovsky, R. M. Martin, and E. Burstein, *Phys. Rev. B* **4**, 1367 (1971).
 - [12] G. Lucovsky and R. M. White, *Phys. Rev. B* **8**, 660 (1973).
 - [13] M. Lannoo and J. N. Decarpigny, *Phys. Rev. B* **8**, 5704 (1973).
 - [14] K. Hübner, *Phys. Stat. Sol. (b)* **68**, 223 (1975).
 - [15] S. Baroni, P. Giannozzi, and A. Testa, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **58**, 1861 (1987).
 - [16] X. Gonze, D.C. Allan, and M.P. Teter, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **68**, 3603 (1992).
 - [17] R. D. King-Smith and D. Vanderbilt, *Phys. Rev. B* **47**, 1651 (1993).
 - [18] S. Dall'Olio, R. Dovesi, and R. Resta, *Phys. Rev. B* **56**, 10105 (1997).
 - [19] S. Massidda, R. Resta, M. Posternak, and A. Baldereschi, *Phys. Rev. B* **52**, R16977 (1995).
 - [20] X. Gonze, Ph. Ghosez, and R. W. Godby, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **78**, 294 (1997).
 - [21] J. Bernetto and D. Vanderbilt, *Phys. Rev. B* **53**, 15417 (1996).
 - [22] R. Resta and S. Sorella, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **74**, 4738 (1995).
 - [23] A. Dal Corso, Ph.D. thesis, SISSA, 1993.
 - [24] M. B. Nardelli, S. Baroni, and P. Giannozzi, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **69**, 1069 (1992).
 - [25] C.-Z. Wang, R. Yu, and H. Krakauer, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **72**, 368 (1994).
 - [26] R. Resta and A. Baldereschi, *Phys. Rev. B* **24**, 4839 (1981).
 - [27] A. Dal Corso, S. Baroni, R. Resta, and S. de Gironcoli, *Phys. Rev. B* **47**, 3588 (1993).
 - [28] P. Giannozzi, de Gironcoli S., Pavone P., and Baroni S., *Phys. Rev. B* **43**, 7231 (1991).
 - [29] F. Bernardini, V. Fiorentini, and D. Vanderbilt, *Phys. Rev. B* **56**, R10024 (1997).
 - [30] K. Karch, P. Pavone, W. Windl and O. Schütt, and D. Strauch, *Phys. Rev. B* **50**, 17054 (1994).
 - [31] C.-Z. Wang, R. Yu, and H. Krakauer, *Phys. Rev. B* **53**, 5430 (1996).
 - [32] G. Wellenhofer *et al.*, *Phys. Rev. B* **53**, 6071 (1996).
 - [33] E. Cockayne and K. M. Rabe, *Phys. Rev. B* **56**, 7947 (1997).
 - [34] O. Schütt *et al.*, *Phys. Rev. B* **50**, 3746 (1994).
 - [35] M. Posternak, A. Baldereschi, H. Krakauer, and R. Resta, *Phys. Rev. B* **55**, R15983 (1997).

- [36] F. Detraux, Ph. Ghosez, and X. Gonze (unpublished).
- [37] L. Stixrude, R. E. Cohen, R. Yu, and H. Krakauer, *American Mineralogist* **81**, 1293 (1996).
- [38] A. Pasquarello and R. Car, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **79**, 1766 (1997).
- [39] Ph. Ghosez, X. Gonze, and J.-P. Michenaud, *Ferroelectrics* **164**, 113 (1995).
- [40] Ph. Ghosez, X. Gonze, Ph. Lambin, and J.-P. Michenaud, *Phys. Rev. B* **51**, 6765 (1995).
- [41] H. B. Callen, *Phys. Rev.* **76**, 1394 (1949).
- [42] B. Szigeti, *Trans. Faraday Soc.* **45**, 155 (1949).
- [43] Ph. Ghosez, X. Gonze, and J.-P. Michenaud, *AAA* **XX**, YYY (1998).
- [44] B. I. Bennett and A. A. Maradudin, *Phys. Rev. B* **5**, 4146 (1972).
- [45] R. M. Martin, *Phys. Rev. B* **9**, 1998 (1974).
- [46] R. M. Martin and K. Kunc, *Phys. Rev. B* **24**, 2081 (1981).
- [47] K. Kunc and R. M. Martin, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **48**, 406 (1982).
- [48] R. Resta, *Ferroelectrics* **136**, 51 (1992).
- [49] R. Resta, *Rev. Mod. Phys.* **66**, 899 (1994).
- [50] L. J. Sham, *Phys. Rev.* **188**, 1431 (1969).
- [51] R. M. Pick, M. H. Cohen, and R. M. Martin, *Phys. Rev. B* **1**, 910 (1970).
- [52] L. J. Sham, in *Dynamical Properties of Solids*, edited by G. K. Horton and A. A. Maradudin (North Holland Publishing Company, Amsterdam, 1974), Chap. 5.
- [53] A. Baldereschi and R. Resta, in *Ab initio Calculation of Phonon Spectra*, edited by J. T. Devreese and V. E. Van Doren and P. E. Van Camp (Plenum Press, New York, 1983), p. 1.
- [54] P. Vogl, *J. Phys. C* **11**, 251 (1978).
- [55] P. B. Littlewood and V. Heine, *J. Phys. C* **12**, 4431 (1979).
- [56] P. B. Littlewood, *J. Phys. C* **12**, 4441 (1979).
- [57] X. Gonze, *Phys. Rev. B* **55**, 10337 (1997).
- [58] X. Gonze and Ch. Lee, *Phys. Rev. B* **55**, 10355 (1997).
- [59] U. V. Waghmare and K. M. Rabe, *Ferroelectrics* **194**, 135 (1997).
- [60] A. Dal Corso, A. Pasquarello, and A. Baldereschi, *Phys. Rev. B* **56**, R11369 (1997).
- [61] A. Dal Corso, S. Baroni, and R. Resta, *Phys. Rev. B* **49**, 5323 (1994).
- [62] S. Yu. Savrasov, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **69**, 2819 (1992).
- [63] R. Yu and H. Krakauer, *Phys. Rev. B* **49**, 4467 (1994).
- [64] K. Kunc and R. Resta, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **51**, 686 (1983).
- [65] R. Resta and K. Kunc, *Phys. Rev. B* **34**, 7146 (1986).
- [66] J. Zak, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **62**, 2747 (1989).
- [67] X. Gonze, *Phys. Rev. B* **52**, 1096 (1995).
- [68] K. M. Rabe and U. V. Waghmare, *Ferroelectrics* **151**, 59 (1994).
- [69] The notation slightly differs from Ref. [57,58] : the derivative are explicitly written, the $\mathbf{q} = \mathbf{0}$ character of the perturbation is omitted. Note that the “prime” indicates that the $\mathbf{G} = 0$ term has been omitted.
- [70] D. Vanderbilt and D. King-Smith, *Phys. Rev. B* **48**, 4442 (1993).

TABLE I. Band-by-band decompositions of the Born effective charge of the Ti atom in the cubic phase of BaTiO₃. In the second column are mentioned reference values expected in a purely ionic material; band-by-band contributions presented in the three next columns were deduced from first-principles calculations. Only the values obtained from Eq. (27) and within the diagonal gauge can be understood in terms of Wannier functions.

	Reference	Diagonal gauge		Parallel gauge
	ionic values	from Eq. (27)	from Eq. (31)	from Eq. (27)
core	+12.00	+12.00	+12.00	+12.00
Ti 3s	-2.00	-2.03	+1.56	-0.36
Ti 3p	-6.00	-6.22	-9.54	-5.50
Ba 5s	0.00	+0.05	-0.36	0.00
O2s	0.00	+0.23	-1.56	-0.41
Ba 5p	0.00	+0.36	+1.47	+0.10
O 2p	0.00	+2.86	+3.68	+1.42
Z_{Ti}^*	+4.00	+7.25	+7.25	+7.25